

Gravitational waves astronomy: the ultimate test for Einstein's General Relativity

Christian Corda

April 9, 2010

Associazione Scientifica Galileo Galilei, Via Pier Cironi 16 - 59100 PRATO,
Italy

E-mail address: cordac.galilei@gmail.com

Abstract

It is well known that Einstein's General Relativity (GR) achieved a great success and overcame lots of experimental tests. On the other hand, GR also showed some shortcomings and flaws which today advise theorists to ask if it is the definitive theory of gravity. In this review we show that, if advanced projects on the detection of Gravitational Waves (GWs) will improve their sensitivity, allowing to perform a GWs astronomy, understanding if Einstein's GR is the correct and definitive theory of gravity will be possible. For this goal, accurate angular and frequency dependent response functions of interferometers for GWs arising from various Theories of Gravity, i.e. GR and Extended Theories of Gravity will have to be used.

This review is founded on the Essay which won an Honorable Mention at the the 2009 Gravity Research Foundation Awards.

The scientific community aims in a first direct detection of GWs in next years (for the current status of GWs interferometers see [1]) confirming the indirect, Nobel Prize Winner, proof of Hulse and Taylor [2].

Detectors for GWs will be important for a better knowledge of the Universe and either to confirm or rule out the physical consistency of GR or of any other theory of gravitation [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. In fact, in the context of Extended Theories of Gravity, some differences between GR and the others theories can be pointed out starting by the linearized theory of gravity [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. In this picture, detectors for GWs are in principle sensitive also to a hypothetical *scalar* component of gravitational radiation, that appears in extended theories of gravity like scalar-tensor gravity [5, 11, 13, 14], bi-metric

theory [6], high order theories [3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12], Brans-Dicke theory [15] and string theory [16].

Motivations on an potential extension of GR arise from the fact that, even if Einstein's Theory [17] achieved a great success (see for example the opinions and of Wheeler who says that "*Among all bodies of physical laws none has ever been found that is simpler or more beautiful than Einstein's geometric theory of gravity*" [17] and of Landau who says that "*General Relativity is, together with Quantum Field Theory, the best scientific theory of all*" [18]) and overcame lots of experimental tests [17], it also showed some shortcomings and flaws [19, 20, 21]. Thus, today theorists ask if it is the correct and ultimate theory of gravity. On the other hand, GR is very difficult to be quantized. This point makes GR different from other field theories like the electromagnetic theory, and also rules out the possibility of treating gravitation like other quantum theories, precluding the unification of gravity with other interactions. At the present time, a consistent Quantum Gravity Theory which leads to the unification of gravitation with the other forces has not been realized [20, 21].

Another point of view defines *Extended Theories of Gravity* those semi-classical theories where the Lagrangian is modified, in respect to the standard Einstein-Hilbert gravitational Lagrangian, adding high-order terms in the curvature invariants (terms like R^2 , $R^{\alpha\beta}R_{\alpha\beta}$, $R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$, $R\Box R$, $R\Box^k R$) or terms with scalar fields non minimally coupled to geometry (terms like $\phi^2 R$) [19, 20, 21]. Terms like those are present, in general, in all the approaches to perform the unification between gravity and other interactions. It is also important to stress that, from a cosmological point of view, these modifies of GR generate inflationary frameworks which solve lots of problems of the Standard Universe Model [22, 23, 24]. Notice that we are not telling that GR is wrong. We are sure that, even in the context of Extended Theories, GR remains the most important part of the structure [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 18, 19, 20, 21]. We only would like to understand if weak modifies on GR's structure could be needed to solve some theoretical and observing problems [19, 20, 21]. In this tapestry, even Einstein told that General Relativity could not be definitive [25] as during his famous research on the Unified Field Theory, he tried to realize a theory that he called "Generalized Theory of Gravitation", and he said that mathematical difficulties precluded him to derive the final equations [25]. On the other hand, it is well known that various Extended Theories of gravity are banned by requirements of cosmology and Solar System tests and, in general, the modification in respect to standard GR has to be very weak in order to satisfy such constrains [26, 27].

In the general framework of cosmological evidences, other considerations suggest an extension of GR. In fact, the accelerated expansion of the Universe, which is today observed, shows that cosmic dynamic is dominated by the so called Dark Energy, which gives a large negative pressure. In this standard picture, such new ingredient is considered as a source of the *right side* of the field equations. It could be some form of un-clustered non-zero vacuum energy which, together with the clustered Dark Matter, drives the global dynamics. This is the famous "concordance model" (Λ CDM) which gives a good tapestry of the

today observed Universe. However, even if in agreement with the CMBR, LSS and SNeIa data, such a model presents several shortcomings as the well known “coincidence” and “cosmological constant” problems [28]. The alternative approach proposed by theorists changes the *left side* of the field equations, seeing if observed cosmic dynamics can be achieved extending GR [19, 20, 21, 29]. In this case, it is not required to find out candidates for Dark Energy and Dark Matter, that, till now, have not been found, but only the “observed” ingredients, which are curvature and baryon matter, have to be taken into account. From this point of view, gravity could be different at various scales [29] and alternative theories can be considered. By thinking in this way, the most popular Dark Energy and Dark Matter models can be achieved considering $f(R)$ theories of gravity, where R is the Ricci curvature scalar, and/or Scalar-Tensor Gravity [19, 20, 21].

The aim of this review is showing that, if advanced projects on the detection of GWs will improve their sensitivity, allowing to perform a GWs astronomy [1], it will be ultimately possible to understand if Einstein’s GR is the correct and definitive theory of gravity [3]. For this goal, accurate angular and frequency dependent response functions of interferometers for GWs arising from various Theories of Gravity, i.e. GR and Extended Theories of Gravity will have to be used [3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 30, 31]. The papers which found this review paper have been the world’s most cited within the official Astroparticle Publication Review of ASPERA during the 2007 with 13 citations [32]. ASPERA is the network of national government agencies responsible for coordinating and funding national research efforts in Astroparticle Physics, see [32]. This review is founded on the essay which won an Honorable Mention at the the 2009 Gravity Research Foundation Awards [3].

Working with $G = 1$, $c = 1$ and $\hbar = 1$ (natural units), the line element for a GW arising from standard General Relativity and propagating in the z direction is [3, 17, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35]

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - dz^2 - (1 + h_+)dx^2 - (1 - h_+)dy^2 - 2h_\times dx dy, \quad (1)$$

where $h_+(t+z)$ and $h_\times(t+z)$ are the weak perturbations due to the $+$ and the $\times$ polarizations which are expressed in terms of synchronous coordinates in the Transverse Traceless (TT) gauge [17]. The total frequency and angular dependent response function (i.e. the detector pattern) to the $+$ polarization of an interferometer with arms in the u and v directions in respect to the propagating GW has been computed in [3, 30, 31], it is:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}^+(\omega) &\equiv \Upsilon_u^+(\omega) - \Upsilon_v^+(\omega) \\ &= \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) - \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi - \cos^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

that, in the low frequencies limit ($\omega \rightarrow 0$) gives the well known low frequency response function of [33, 34] for the $+$ polarization:

$$\tilde{H}^+(\omega) = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^2 \theta) \cos 2\phi + O(\omega). \quad (3)$$

Sketching the derivation of eq. (2) is important for a sake of clearness [3]. Following [3, 30, 31], the rotation in respect to the u and v directions is

$$\begin{aligned} x &= -u \cos \theta \cos \phi - v \cos \theta \sin \phi + w \sin \theta \\ y &= u \sin \phi - v \cos \phi \\ z &= u \sin \theta \cos \phi + v \sin \theta \sin \phi + w \cos \theta. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Then, the line element transforms as [3, 30, 31]

$$g^{ik} = \frac{\partial x^i}{\partial x'^l} \frac{\partial x^k}{\partial x'^m} g'^{lm}. \quad (5)$$

Taking into account only the + polarization and using eqs. (4) and (5), the line element in the $\vec{u}$ direction becomes:

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + [1 + (\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi) h_+(t + u \sin \theta \cos \phi)] du^2. \quad (6)$$

A good way to analyse variations in the proper distance (time) is by means of “bouncing photons” [3, 30, 31]. A photon can be launched from the interferometer’s beam-splitter to be bounced back by the mirror. This kind of analysis was created by Rakhmanov in [35]. Actually, it has been strongly generalized to angular dependences, scalar waves and massive GWs in [3, 4, 5, 9, 13, 30, 31].

The condition for null geodesics ($ds^2 = 0$) in eq. (6) gives the coordinate velocity of the photon:

$$v_p^2 \equiv \left(\frac{du}{dt}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{[1 + (\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi) h_+(t + u \sin \theta \cos \phi)]}, \quad (7)$$

which will be used for calculations of the photon propagation time between the beam-splitter and the mirror [3, 30, 31, 35]. If one assumes that the beam splitter is located in the origin of the new coordinate system (i.e. $u_b = 0$, $v_b = 0$, $w_b = 0$) the analysis is simplified. As we are in the TT gauge, the coordinates of the beam-splitter $u_b = 0$ and of the mirror $u_m = L$ do not change under the influence of the GW [3, 17, 30, 31, 35], thus the duration of the forward trip is given by

$$T_1(t) = \int_0^L \frac{du}{v_p(t' + u \sin \theta \cos \phi)}, \quad (8)$$

with

$$t' = t - (L - u).$$

In the equation (8) t' is the delay time (i.e. t is the time at which the photon arrives in the position L , so $L - u = t - t'$).

At first order in h_+ the integral (8) can be approximated with

$$T_1(t) = T + \frac{\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi}{2} \int_0^L h_+(t' + u \sin \theta \cos \phi) du, \quad (9)$$

where $T = L$ (recall that natural units are used) is the transit time of the photon in absence of the GW. Similarly, the duration of the return trip is

$$T_2(t) = T + \frac{\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi}{2} \int_L^0 h_+(t' + u \sin \theta \cos \phi) (-du), \quad (10)$$

and now the delay time is

$$t' = t - (u - l).$$

The round-trip time is the sum of $T_2(t)$ and $T_1[t - T_2(t)]$. As the difference between the exact and the approximate values is second order in h_+ , $T_1[t - T_2(t)]$ can be approximated by $T_1(t - T)$. Then, to first order in h_+ , the duration of the round-trip is

$$T_{r.t.}(t) = T_1(t - T) + T_2(t). \quad (11)$$

By using eqs. (9) and (10) one gets that deviations of this round-trip time (i.e. proper distance) from its unperturbed value are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \delta T(t) = & \frac{\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi}{2} \int_0^L [h_+(t - 2T - u(1 - \sin \theta \cos \phi)) + \\ & + h_+(t + u(1 + \sin \theta \cos \phi))] du. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Introducing the Fourier transform of the $+$ polarization of the field, defined by

$$\tilde{h}_+(\omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt h_+(t) \exp(i\omega t), \quad (13)$$

and using the Fourier translation theorem, in the frequency domain it is:

$$\delta \tilde{T}(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} (\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi) \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) \tilde{h}_+(\omega), \quad (14)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) = & \frac{-1 + \exp(2i\omega L)}{2i\omega(1 + \sin^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi)} + \\ & + \frac{-\sin \theta \cos \phi ((1 + \exp(2i\omega L)) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 - \sin \theta \cos \phi))}{2i\omega(1 + \sin \theta \cos^2 \phi)} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and $\tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) \rightarrow L$ when $\omega \rightarrow 0$.

Thus, if one defines a “signal” in the u arm like $S(\omega) \equiv \frac{\delta \tilde{T}(\omega)}{2T}$, the total response function of this arm of the interferometer to the $+$ component is:

$$\Upsilon_u^+(\omega) \equiv \frac{S(\omega)}{\tilde{h}_+(\omega)} = \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \cos^2 \phi - \sin^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi). \quad (16)$$

In the same way, one gets the response function of the v arm of the interferometer to the $+$ polarization:

$$\Upsilon_v^+(\omega) = \frac{(\cos^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi - \cos^2 \phi)}{2L} \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi) \quad (17)$$

where, now

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi) = & \frac{-1 + \exp(2i\omega L)}{2i\omega(1 + \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi)} + \\ & + \frac{-\sin \theta \sin \phi ((1 + \exp(2i\omega L)) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 - \sin \theta \sin \phi))}{2i\omega(1 + \sin^2 \theta \sin^2 \phi)}, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with $\tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi) \rightarrow L$ when $\omega \rightarrow 0$.

The total response function is the difference between (16) and (17), thus one obtains immediately eq. (2).

The same analysis works for the $\times$ polarization (see [30, 31] for details). At the end, the total frequency and angular dependent response function of an interferometer to the $\times$ polarization is:

$$\tilde{H}^\times(\omega) = \frac{-\cos \theta \cos \phi \sin \phi}{L} [\tilde{H}_u(\omega, \theta, \phi) + \tilde{H}_v(\omega, \theta, \phi)], \quad (19)$$

that, in the low frequencies limit ($\omega \rightarrow 0$), gives the low frequency response function of [33, 34] for the $\times$ polarization:

$$\tilde{H}^\times(\omega) = -\cos \theta \sin 2\phi + O(\omega). \quad (20)$$

The case of massless Scalar-Tensor Gravity has been discussed in [5, 13] with a “bouncing photons analysis” similar to the previous one. In this case, the line-element in the TT gauge can be extended with one more polarization, labelled with $\Phi(t + z)$, i.e.

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - dz^2 - (1 + h_+ + \Phi)dx^2 - (1 - h_+ + \Phi)dy^2 - 2h_\times dx dy. \quad (21)$$

The total frequency and angular dependent response function of an interferometer to this “scalar” polarization is [5, 13]

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H}^\Phi(\omega) = & \frac{\sin \theta}{2i\omega L} \{ \cos \phi [1 + \exp(2i\omega L) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 + \sin \theta \cos \phi)] + \\ & - \sin \phi [1 + \exp(2i\omega L) - 2 \exp i\omega L (1 + \sin \theta \sin \phi)] \}, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

that, in the low frequencies limit ($\omega \rightarrow 0$), gives the low frequency response function of [16] for the Φ polarization:

$$\tilde{H}^\Phi(\omega) = -\sin^2 \theta \cos 2\phi + O(\omega). \quad (23)$$

In [13] the response function (22) has been used to study the cross-correlation between the Virgo interferometer and the monopole mode of the MiniGRAIL resonant sphere for the detection of massless stochastic scalar GWs. Even if such a cross correlation is very small, a maximum is present at about $2710Hz$, i.e. within the sensitivity's range of both of MiniGRAIL and Virgo [13]. Then, if the eventual detection of a monopole mode of the MiniGRAIL bar at about $2710Hz$ will coincide with a signal detected by the Virgo interferometer at the same frequency, such a detection will be a strong endorsement for massless Scalar Tensor Gravity. Indeed, the monopole mode of a sphere cannot be excited by ordinary tensor waves arising from standard GR, see [13] for details.

The cases of massive Scalar-Tensor Gravity and $f(R)$ theories are totally equivalent [3, 4, 5, 8]. This is not a surprise as it is well known that there is a more general conformal equivalence between Scalar-Tensor Gravity and $f(R)$ theories, even if there is a large debate on the possibility that such a conformal equivalence should be a *physical* equivalence too [19, 20, 21]. In such cases, the presence of a small mass generates a longitudinal component in the third polarization. Thus, the extension of the TT gauge to the third massive mode is impossible [3, 4, 5, 8]. But gauge transformations permit to write the line-element due to such a third scalar mode in a conformally flat form [3, 4, 5, 8]:

$$ds^2 = [1 + \Phi(t - v_G z)](-dt^2 + dz^2 + dx^2 + dy^2). \quad (24)$$

Assuming that the interferometer arm is parallel to the propagating GW, a longitudinal response function can be associated to such a massive mode [3, 4, 5, 8]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_l(\omega) = & \frac{1}{m^4 \omega^2 L} \left(\frac{1}{2} (1 + \exp[2i\omega L]) m^2 \omega^2 L (m^2 - 2\omega^2) + \right. \\ & -i \exp[2i\omega L] \omega^2 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2} (4\omega^2 + m^2 (-1 - iL\omega)) + \\ & + \omega^2 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2} (-4i\omega^2 + m^2 (i + \omega L)) + \\ & + \exp[iL(\omega + \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2})] (m^6 L + m^4 \omega^2 L + 8i\omega^4 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2} + \\ & + m^2 (-2L\omega^4 - 2i\omega^2 \sqrt{-m^2 + \omega^2})) + 2 \exp[i\omega L] \omega^3 (-3m^2 + 4\omega^2) \sin[\omega L] \Big). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Eq. (25) has been obtained in [4] with the “bouncing photons analysis” and in [8] with a different treatment that used geodesic deviation. m in eq. (25) is the small mass of the particle associated to the GW and v_G in eq. (24) is the particle's velocity. In fact, the group velocity can be expressed in terms of a

wave-packet [4, 8]. In this case, the relation mass-velocity is $m = \sqrt{(1 - v_G^2)}\omega$, see [4, 8] for details.

As signals from GWs are quite weak [1], in order to discriminate between various signals, advanced projects on the detection of GWs will have to improve their sensitivity allowing to perform a GWs astronomy [3]. Then, one will only have to look the interferometer response functions to understand if GR is the ultimate theory of gravity. If only the two response functions (2) and (19) will be present, the conclusion will be that GR is definitive. If the response function (22) will be present too, then massless Scalar - Tensor Gravity will be the correct theory of gravitation. Finally, if a longitudinal response function will be present, i.e. Eq. (25) for a wave propagating parallel to one interferometer arm, or its generalization to angular dependences, the correct theory of gravity will be massive Scalar - Tensor Gravity which is equivalent to $f(R)$ theories. In any case, such response functions will permit, in an ultimate way, to understand if Einstein's GR is the correct and definitive theory of gravity. This is because GR is the only modern gravity theory which admits only the two response functions (2) and (19) [3, 4, 5, 8, 17, 18, 30, 31]. Such response functions correspond to the two "canonical" polarizations h_+ and $h_\times$. Thus, if a third polarization will be present, a third response function will be detected by GWs interferometers and this will ultimately rule out GR like the correct and definitive theory of gravity.

Resuming, in this review we have shown that, by assuming that advanced projects on the detection of GWs will improve their sensitivity allowing to perform a GWs astronomy, and obtaining accurate angular and frequency dependent response functions of interferometers for GWs arising from various Theories of Gravity, i.e. GR and Extended Theories of Gravity, understanding if Einstein's GR is the correct and definitive theory of gravity will be ultimately possible.

Acknowledgements

The Associazione Scientifica Galileo Galilei has to be thanked for supporting this paper.

References

- [1] A. Giazotto - Journ. of Phys., Conf. Series 120, 032002 (2008)
- [2] R.A. Hulse and J.H. Taylor, Astrophys. J. Lett. 195, 151 (1975)
- [3] C. Corda - Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. D, 18, 14, 2275-2282 (2009, Honorable Mention Gravity Research Foundation)
- [4] C. Corda - J. Cosmol. Astropart. Phys. JCAP04009 (2007)
- [5] Capozziello S and C. Corda - Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **15**, 1119 -1150 (2006)
- [6] C. Corda - Astropart. Phys. 28, 2, 247-250 (2007)

- [7] C. Corda - Astropart. Phys. 30, 4 209-215 (2008)
- [8] S. Capozziello, C. Corda and M. F. De Laurentis - Phys.Lett. B, 669, 5, 255-259, (2008)
- [9] C. Corda - Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. A 23, 10, 1521-1535 (2008)
- [10] C. Corda - Int. Journ. Mod. Phys. A 22, 26, 4859-4881 (2007)
- [11] T. Damour and G. Esposito-Farese - Class. Quant. Grav. **9** 2093-2176 (1992)
- [12] S. Capozziello, C. Corda and M. F. De Laurentis - Mod. Phys. Lett. A 22, 15, 1097-1104 (2007)
- [13] C. Corda - Mod. Phys. Lett. A No. 22, 23, 1727-1735 (2007) S. Capozziello,
- [14] S. Capozziello, C. Corda and M. F. De Laurentis - Mod. Phys. Lett. A 22, 35, 2647-2655 (2007)
- [15] C. Brans and R. H. Dicke - Phys. Rev. 124, 925 (1961)
- [16] N. Bonasia and M. Gasperini - Phys. Rew. D **71** 104020 (2005)
- [17] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler - “Gravitation” - W.H.Feeman and Company - 1973
- [18] L. Landau and E. Lifshits - “Teoria dei campi” - Editori riuniti edition III (1999)
- [19] S. Nojiri and S.D. Odintsov - Int. J. Geom. Meth. Mod. Phys. 4:115-146 (2007)
- [20] V. Faraoni and T. P. Sotiriou - arXiv:0805.1726 (2008), to appear in Rev. Mod. Phys.
- [21] S. Capozziello and M. Francaviglia - Gen. Rel. Grav. 40, 2-3, 357 (2008)
- [22] A. Guth - Phys. Rev. **23** 347 (1981)
- [23] A. Guth - “The Inflationary Universe: The Quest for a New Theory of Cosmic Origins” - Addison-Wesley/Perseus Books (1997)
- [24] A. A. Starobinsky - Phys. Lett. B **91**, 99 (1980)
- [25] A. Pais - *Subtle is the Lord* - Oxford University Press (2005)
- [26] T. Clifton and J. D. Barrow - Phys. Rev. D **72**, 103005 (2005)
- [27] B. Li, J. D. Barrow, D. F. Mota, and H. S. Zhao - Phys. Rev. D 78, 064021 (2008)
- [28] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra - Rev. Mod. Phys. 75 8559 (2003)

- [29] C. M. - Will *Theory and Experiments in Gravitational Physics*, Cambridge Univ. Press Cambridge (1993)
- [30] Corda - Astropart. Phys. **27**, No 6, 539-549 (2007)
- [31] C. Corda - Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **16**, 9, 1497-1517 (2007)
- [32] http://www.aspera-eu.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=125&Itemid=99C
- [33] K. S. Thorne- *300 Years of Gravitation* - Ed. Hawking SW and Israel W Cambridge University Press p. 330 (1987)
- [34] P. Saulson - *Fundamental of Interferometric Gravitational Waves Detectors* - World Scientific, Singapore (1994)
- [35] Rakhmanov M - Phys. Rev. D **71** 084003 (2005) <http://www.aspera-eu.org>